DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 337 TM 810 880

AUTHOR Natriello, Gary; Dornbusch, Sanford M.
TITLE Academic Instruction or Behavioral Control: An Experimental Study of Teacher Responses to Classroom Problems.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (64th, Boston, MA, April, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; *Classroom Techniques; *Learning Problems; Social Behavior; Student Behavior; *Teacher Attitudes Teacher Effectiveness; *Teacher Response

ABSTRACT

An examination of teachers' responses to questionnaires identifying sixteen classroom academic and social behavior problems revealed different reactions to each type. A system was developed to measure the responses which were coded in terms of the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards or evidenced warmth. Teachers presented standards more frequently for social behavior than for academic work. This would seem to indicate teachers are more interested in behavioral control than in academic instruction. However, teachers react to academic problems with warmth and concern. Four factors influenced teacher behavior. These include teachers' conception of the student tasks, relative visibility of student tasks of classroom achievement and behavior, relative visibility of teaching task of academic instruction and behavioral control in school, and power of teachers' supervisors over them. Schools seem to supervise social behavior more closely than academic work. Student performance in academic areas is perceived dependent on ability and effort, whereas behavior performance is seen as dependent primarily on effort. Several features of school organization are identified which cause schools to supervise social behavior more adequately than academic work. (DWH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209337

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Academic Instruction or Behavioral Control:
An Experimental Study of Teacher Responses to Classroom Problems

Gary Natriello, Washington University
Sanford M. Dornbusch, Stanford University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Natriello

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 810 880

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association
Boston, Massachusetts, April, 1980

Academic Instruction or Behavioral Control:
An Experimental Study of Teacher Responses to Classroom Problems

Gary Natriello, Washington University
Sanford M. Dornbusch, Stanford University

Introduction

Research and commentary on U.S. public schools during the last decade contains a good deal of discussion as to whether American schools function primarily to transmit skills and knowledge to the young or whether they serve primarily as instruments of social control. Those adopting the latter position (Katz, 1971; Spring, 1972; Bowles, 1972; Bowles and Gintis, 1976), have argued that society or the dominant social classes have developed, maintained, and continue to support schools not to transmit knowledge and skills, but rather to exercise control over young members of the society, particularly children from the lower classes, so that they come to support the dominant social groups and modes of organization in modern American society.

Although some investigators have begun to examine the mechanisms by which societal norms are transmitted through the schools (Dreeben, 1968), there have been few attempts to point out how schools function as mechanisms of social control at the classroom level (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). Further, aside from the general arguments dealing with society's control of the schools and the link between the world of work and the world of the school typically summarized as the "correspondence principle" (Carter, 1976), little consideration has been given to the mechanisms that might operate to place teachers and students in classrooms where "appropriate" behavior is valued above academic work. Conspicuously absent from this debate between those

emphasizing the role of the school as the transmitter of skills and knowledge and those pointing to them as institutions of social control has been consideration of some of the more subtle organizational properties of schools that might contribute to the social control functions of schools. Indeed, aside from the substantial body of research on school tracking systems (Cicourel and Kitsuse, 1963; Rosenbaum, 1975; Alexander, Cook, and McDill, 1978), we have developed little insight into the role of school organization in social control. Proponents of the "schools as mechanisms for social control" position have examined teacher attitudes (Bowles and Gintis, 1976), without offering an adequate explanation of the link between macro-level social forces and individual teacher behavior.

Design Considerations

In the present study we begin by examining patterns of teacher classroom behavior to determine if the assertion that schools function primarily as mechanisms of social control is supported at the classroom level. We then seek to explain those patterns of behavior not in terms of individual attitudes and orientations, but rather in terms of the organizational contexts within which teaching takes place.

Earlier studies of teacher behavior patterns have examined teacher behavior in response to students with different characteristics. Indeed, the larger project of research from which this paper is taken (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979b) includes student characteristics such as sex, ethnicity, achievement record, and social behavior record as independent variables, leading to predictions of teacher behavior. It was our assess-

ment that most traditional research on teacher behavior toward students with different characteristics was seriously flawed by the failure to include measures of student behavior. Elsewhere we have reported on the importance of student behavior in predicting patterns of teacher behavior (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979a). More importantly, for the present paper, our inclusion of student behavior as a variable enabled us to conceptualize two distinct teaching tasks and to consider the management of those tasks in school organizations.

Basically, we argue that classroom teachers must respond to two types of classroom problems presented by students: student failures to conform to the academic norms of the school, and student failures to conform to the social behavior norms of the school. Thus we view teachers as having at least two tasks in the classroom--providing academic instruction and maintaining behavioral control. Determining the relative extent to which teachers carry out their tasks is the goal of the present study, a goal that requires us to consider teacher behavior along some relevant dimensions.

In the absence of a theory of teaching effectiveness (Rosenshine, 1976), the selection of teacher behavior variables becomes problematic. The teaching effectiveness literature has attempted without success to deal with the problem by considering an incredibly broad range of teacher behavior variables (Rosenshine and Furst, 1973). Our attempt to select appropriate dimensions of teacher behavior was guided by our committment to studying classroom behavior in the context of the school organization.

In his review of the literature on the school as an organization, Bidwell (1965) points to several features of educational institutions which have implications for teaching effectiveness. He begins by noting that the student role is a recruitment role and that:

> "Young persons are compelled to enter school systems as students simply because of their placement in certain age grades, without reference to specific performances. Furthermore, since students are to be socialized into adult life, the central activities of this role are not directly relevant to the immediate interests or lives of its incumbents."
> (Bidwell, 1965:973)

Bidwell goes on to discuss two dimensions of teacher behavior in dealing with students. First, he notes that in order to produce a uniform product, schools and teachers engage in the "universalistic and thus uniform assessment of student accomplishment." Thus teachers present institutional standards to students and evaluate their performance in terms of those standards.

However, presenting standards to students and demanding their compliance may not be enough to promote learning in view of the fact that students may not see schools as relevant to their immediate interests. Bidwell notes this while reviewing the contribution of Willard Waller to the study of schools:

> "Motivation to learn," he said, "is very largely a product of a close, warm relation between teacher and student. Compliance may produce little instinsic learning and a good deal of internal resistant among students."
> (Bidwell, 1965:979)

Thus Bidwell suggests that teaching behavior consists of instances of universalistic assessment as well as instances of more diffuse respon-

siveness.* In the present study we have specified these dimensions of teaching behavior as:

a) the extent to which teachers present school standards for performance;
b) the extent to which teachers are warm and friendly to students.

We assume that to effectively supervise students in classrooms, teachers must engage in both of these behaviors (though this assumption may be modified by the context in which teaching occurs), an assumption which although never directly tested, receives some support from a range of studies in the social-psychology of teaching (Guskin and Guskin, 1970). While the selection of teacher standards and teacher warmth as relevant dimensions of teaching behavior is not without difficulties, it begins to address the problem of identifying facets of teacher behavior that have meaning in terms of the structural aspects of the teaching-learning situation. Accordingly, we examine the extent to which these teacher behaviors are evident in the classroom tasks of academic instruction and behavioral control.

Procedures

We asked teachers to complete questionnaires designed to determine how they handle typical classroom problems. In the questionnaire teachers were presented with typical classroom problems and asked to explain how

* Bidwell points out that these behaviors may be perceived as conflicting. Elsewhere we have discussed this issue (Natriello, 1979), and presented an analysis of the data from our studies focusing on the relationship between teacher standards and teacher warmth. (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a)

they would respond to students' failures to conform to the academic or social behavior norms of the school. Sixteen different classroom problems, eight involving failure to conform to academic norms and eight involving failure to conform to social behavior norms were developed in consultation with a group of classroom teachers. The problems were as follows:

Academic Problems

1. You see that a student in your class is reading a jokebook instead of an assignment from the text.
2. You notice that a student in your class has fallen asleep.
3. During a test you notice that a student in your class is making no effort to complete the test.
4. You see that a student in your class has failed to bring textbook, paper, and writing materials to class.
5. After writing a rather complicated homework assignment on the board, you notice that a student in your class does not copy it down.
6. You notice that a student in your class is not doing the assigned classwork.
7. You see that a student in your class keeps looking out the window instead of paying attention.
8. You see that a student in your class is not handing in homework assignments.

Social Behavior Problems:

9. You hear a student in your class talking to other students and disturbing them.
10. You see a student in your class kick the student at the next desk.
11. You see a student in your class write obscenities on the blackboard unaware that you are watching.
12. You note that a student in your class keeps coming in late.
13. A student in your class makes sarcastic comments and disturbs you while you are talking to the class.
14. While you are lecturing, a student in your class stamps on a paper cup to make a loud noise.
15. You see a student in your class shoot a spitball across the room.
16. You note that a student in your class is being belligerent and agressive toward other students.

These problems were ordered randomly and their position on the questionnaire was systematically rotated.

In one form of the questionnaire, which we called the hypothetical student study, teachers were presented with a hypothetical profile of a student involved in each problem. The profile contained information on the student's ethnicity, sex, academic achievement record, and social behavior record. After reading the classroom problem and the student profile, teachers were asked to explain how they would respond to the problem. Teacher replies were scored according to the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and/or warmth.

In a second form of the questionnaire, which we called the roll book student study, teachers were again presented with typical classroom problems and asked how they would respond. This time the teachers were not provided with student profiles. Instead, they were asked to select students at random from their roll books and to associate each with a specific classroom problem selected at random. Thus teachers were asked how they would respond if each student selected at random from their roll books failed to conform to a randomly selected school norm. At the end of the questionnaire teachers were asked to supply information on the status characteristics of each student. As with the first questionnaire, teacher responses were scored according to the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and/or warmth.

We developed two different studies that would provide comparable data and that would complement each other. The hypothetical student study allowed us to systematically control the effects of student characteristics on teacher responses to the two types of student problems. The roll book student

study had the advantage of allowing us to get closer to the actual classroom behavior of teachers by asking them to react to problems associated with students from their own classes. By using both techniques to study the performance of teachers on the tasks of academic instruction and behavioral control we can have increased faith in findings supported by both studies.

However, it is important to note here that while using questionnaires to collect data on teacher classroom behavior has many advantages, it also has the major disadvantage of not directly observing classroom behavior. Teachers will, no doubt, respond differently to the hypothetical problems presented in the questionnaires than they would to actual problems presented in the classroom for two reasons. First, they have the time to reflect on their responses to the questionnaires. Second, they are presenting their ideas to an outside audience. This means that the responses to the questionnaires do not provide a substitute for classroom behavior, but rather ideas (and perhaps an ideology) linked to it.

In both studies, teachers were asked to provide open-ended responses to the classroom problems. Their responses were coded in terms of the extent to which they evidenced the presentation of standards and the extent to which they evidenced warmth. We adopted the following multiple value coding system for each dimension:

Standards
0 = No Evidence of Standards
1 = Implicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-making
2 = Implicit Standards Communicated to the Student
3 = Explicit Standards Used in the Teacher's Decision-making
4 = Explicit Standards Communicated to the Student

Warmth
0 = No Personal Concern
1 = Implicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision-making
2 = Explicit Personal Concern Used in the Teacher's Decision-making
3 = Implicit Personal Concern Communicated to the Student
4 = Explicit Personal Concern Communicated to the Student

Results

The hypothetical student study involved 156 teachers in 14 schools, each teacher responding to 16 classroom problems associated with hypothetical student profiles, a total of 2,469 individual responses. The roll book student study involved 168 teachers in 18 schools responding to eight classroom problems which they associated with students from their own roll books, a total of 1,344 responses. The data have been analyzed from a number of different perspectives. Earlier papers have discussed relative differences in teacher responses to student behavior and characteristics individually (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1979a), the relationship between teacher standards and teacher warmth (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980a), and the stratification of socialization experiences for students of different ability levels (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1980b).

In this paper we limit our analysis to an examination of teacher responses to the classroom problems. There are several ways to look at the pattern of teacher responses to the problems. First, teacher responses to individual problems can be examined. Tables 1 to 4 present the teacher responses from the two studies scored for standards and warmth.

While teachers differed in their responses to each problem, there are patterns of differences in the teacher responses to the various problems. For instance, Tables 1 and 2 show that Problems, 11--Coming in late; 9--Shooting Spitballs; and 14--Making Sarcastic Comments evoked high percentages of explicitly communicated standards in both studies. On the other hand, Problems, 3--Does Not Copy Assignment; 5--Not Completing Test; 1--Looking out the Window; and 2--Falling Asleep in Class evoked low percentages of explicitly communi-

cated standards. In both studies, teachers were more likely to present standards for social behavior than for academic work.

As for warmth, Tables 3 and 4 show that teachers also differed in their responses to each problem. Problems, 1--Looking out the Window; 2--Falling Asleep in Class; 5--Not Completing Test; and 6--Not Doing Classwork evoked high percentages of teacher warmth, while Problems, 11-Coming in Late; 14--Making Sarcastic Comments; 15--Writing Obscenities on the Board; and 10--Stamping on a Paper Cup evoked low percentages of teacher warmth. Once again there is an overall pattern. Teachers were more likely to present warmth in response to academic problems than in response to social behavior problems.

The pattern suggested by the analyses of responses to individual problems holds when we analyze the responses a second way, this time comparing teacher responses to all academic problems with teacher responses to all social behavior problems. Teachers are more likely to present standards for social behavior problems than for academic problems in both studies. The gammas indicating the association between teacher standards and problem type (academic versus behavioral) are 0.41 for the hypothetical student study and 0.32 for the roll book student study. Teachers presented more standards in response to social behavior problems than in response to academic problems. The association between warmth and problem type (academic versus behavioral) is just the opposite. The gammas indicating this association are -0.34 in the hypothetical student study and -0.31 in the roll book student study. Thus teachers were more likely to present warmth in response to academic problems than they are in response to social behavior problems.

TABLE 1

Distribution of Teacher Responses Scored for Standards for Each Classroom Problem in the Hypothetical Student Study

#	PROBLEM	STANDARDS No Evidence	Implicit Dec. Mak.	Implicit Comm.	Emplicit Dec. Mak.	Emplicit Comm.	
Academic Problems:							
1	Looking Out the Window	13 (8.5%)	31 (20.3%)	90 (58.8%)	4 (2.5%)	15 (9.8%)	N 153
2	Fallen Asleep	17 (11.3%)	9 (6.0%)	104 (68.9%)	11 (7.3%)	10 (6.6%)	N 151
3	Does Not Copy Assignment	12 (8.9%)	9 (6.2%)	91 (62.8%)	2 (1.4%)	31 (21.4%)	N 145
4	Not Doing Homework	4 (2.6%)	6 (3.9%)	79 (51.6%)	5 (3.3%)	59 (38.6%)	N 153
5	Not Completing Test	6 (3.9%)	8 (5.3%)	107 (70.4%)	9 (5.9%)	22 (14.5%)	N 152
6	Not Doing Classwork	4 (2.6%)	8 (5.3%)	98 (64.9%)	8 (5.3%)	33 (21.9%)	N 151
7	Reading Jokebook	9 (5.8%)	4 (2.6%)	75 (48.7%)	16 (10.4%)	50 (32.5%)	N 154
8	Failing to Bring Materials	14 (9.7%)	26 (17.9%)	50 (34.5%)	15 (10.3%)	45 (31.0%)	N 150
Social Behavior Problems:							
9	Shoots Spitballs	4 (2.6%)	4 (2.6%)	60 (39.0%)	7 (4.5%)	78 (50.6%)	N 153
10	Talking	2 (1.3%)	5 (3.2%)	70 (45.2%)	22 (14.2%)	56 (36.1%)	N 155
11	Coming in Late	0 (0.0%)	7 (4.7%)	40 (26.1%)	22 (11.1%)	56 (58.2%)	N 125
12	Belligerent to Others	0 (0.0%)	9 (5.8%)	85 (54.5%)	16 (10.3%)	46 (29.5%)	N 156
13	Kicks Other Students	1 (0.7%)	7 (4.5%)	68 (44.7%)	10 (6.6%)	65 (42.8%)	N 151
14	Makes Sarcastic Comments	1 (0.7%)	6 (4.0%)	56 (37.3%)	21 (14.0%)	65 (43.3%)	N 151
15	Writing Obscenities	1 (0.7%)	8 (5.3%)	58 (38.4%)	11 (7.3%)	73 (48.3%)	N 151
16	Stamps on Paper Cup	8 (5.2%)	14 (9.1%)	64 (41.6%)	8 (5.2%)	58 (37.7%)	N 152

TABLE 2

Distribution of Teacher Responses Scored for Standards for Each Classroom Problem in the Roll Book Student Study

#	PROBLEM	STANDARDS No Evidence	Implicit Dec. Mak.	Implicit Comm.	Emplicit Dec. Mak.	Emplicit Comm.	
Academic Problems:							
1.	Looking Out the Window	9 (10.5%)	14 (16.3%)	43 (50.0%)	5 (5.8%)	15 (17.4%)	N 86
2.	Fallen Asleep	14 (17.1%)	11 (13.4%)	47 (57.3%)	5 (6.1%)	5 (6.1%)	N 82
3.	Does Not Copy	6 (7.2%)	3 (3.6%)	56 (67.5%)	3 (3.6%)	15 (18.1%)	N 83
4.	Not Doing Homework	4 (4.7%)	2 (2.3 %)	39 (45.3%)	4 (4.7%)	37 (43.0%)	N 86
5	Not Completing Test	2 (2.5%)	2 (2.5%)	64 (81.0%)	3 (3.8%)	8 (10.1%)	N 79
6	Not Doing Classwork	1 (1.2%)	6 (7.6%)	50 (63.3%)	2 (2.5%)	20 (25.3%)	N 79
7	Reading Jokebook	7 (8.8%)	2 (2.5%)	40 (50.0%)	14 (17.5%)	17 (21.3%)	N 80
8	Failing to Bring Materials	13 (17.1%)	9 (11.8%)	23 (30.3%)	5 (6.6%)	26 (34.2%)	N 76
Social Behavior Problems:							
9	Shoots Spitballs	1 (1.2%)	4 (4.7%)	45 (53.0%)	3 (3.5%)	32 (37.7%)	N 85
10	Talking	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.5%)	41 (51.9%)	9 (11.4%)	27 (34.2%)	N 79
11	Coming in Late	2 (2.6%)	3 (3.9%)	24 (30.8%)	6 (7.7%)	43 (55.1%)	N 78
12	Belligerent to Others	0 (0.0%)	6 (6.8%)	53 (60.2%)	4 (4.5%)	25 (28.4%)	N 88
13	Kicks Other Students	4 (5.6%)	6 (7.5%)	40 (50.0%)	8 (10.0%)	22 (27.5%)	N 80
14	Makes Sarcastic Comments	3 (3.5%)	5 (5.8%)	35 (40.7%)	11 (12.8%)	32 (37.2%)	N 86
15	Writing Obscenities	0 (0.0%)	2 (2.6%)	46 (60.5%)	6 (7.9%)	22 (29.0%)	N 76
16	Stamps on Paper Cup	5 (6.3%)	3 (3.8%)	40 (50.6%)	3 (3.8%)	28 (35.4%)	N 79

Table 3

Distribution of Teacher Responses Scored for Warmth for Each Classroom Problem in the Hypothetical Student Study

#	PROBLEM	CONCERN					
		No Concern	Implicit Dec. Mak.	Explicit Comm.	Implicit Dec. Mak.	Emplicit Comm.	
Academic Problems:							
1	Looking Out the Window	53 (34.4%)	62 (40.3%)	24 (15.6%)	14 (9.1%)	1 (0.6%)	N 154
2	Fallen Asleep	39 (25.5%)	41 (26.8%)	37 (24.2%)	25 (16.3%)	10 (6.5%)	N 152
3	Does Not Copy Assignment	66 (44.9%)	44 (29.9%)	29 (19.7%)	6 (4.1%	2 (1.4%)	N 147
4	Not Doing Homework	48 (31.6%)	48 (31.6%)	31 (20.4%)	17 (11.2%)	8 (5.3%)	N 152
5	Not Completing Test	42 (27.6%)	42 (27.6%)	32 (21.1%)	32 (21.1%)	4 (2.6%)	N 152
6	Not Doing Classwork	50 (33.1%)	51 (33.8%)	29 (19.2%)	18 (11.9%)	3 (2.0%)	N 151
7	Reading Jokebook	88 (57.5%)	41 (26.8%)	20 (13.1%)	3 (2.0%)	1 (0.7%)	N 153
8	Failing to Bring Materials	82 (53.9%)	51 (33.6%)	11 (7.2%)	7 (4.6%)	1 (0.7%)	N 152
Social Behavior Problems:							
9	Shoots Spitballs	106 (69.3%)	34 (22.2%)	8 (5.2%)	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.3%)	N 152
10	Talking	86 (55.5%)	38 (24.5%)	22 (14.2%)	8 (5.2%)	1 (0.6%)	N 155
11	Coming in Late	92 (60.1%)	38 (24.8%)	15 (9.8%)	7 (4.6%)	1 (0.7%)	N 153
12	Belligerent to Others	60 (38.7%)	39 (25.2%)	29 (18.7%)	25 (16.1%)	2 (1.3%)	N 155
13	Kicks Other Students	97 (63.8%)	42 (27.6%)	10 (6.6%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (0.7%)	N 152
14	Makes Sarcastic Comments	98 (65.8%)	35 (23.5%)	11 (7.4%)	2 (1.3%)	3 (2.0%)	N 149
15	Writing Obscenities	94 (62.3%)	35 (23.2%)	12 (7.9%)	7 (4.6%)	3 (2.0%)	N 151
16	Stamps on Paper Cup	96 (62.7%)	43 (28.1%)	11 (7.2%)	2 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	N 152

TABLE 4

Distribution of Teacher Responses Scored for Warmth for Each Classroom Problem in the Roll Book Student Study

#	PROBLEM	CONCERN: No Concern	Implicit Dec. Mak.	Explicit Dec. Mak.	Implicit Comm.	Explicit Comm.	
Academic Problems:							
1	Looking Out the Window	26 (30.2%)	35 (40.7%)	21 (24.4%)	2 (2.3%)	2 (2.3%)	N 86
2	Fallen Asleep	23 (27.4%)	33 (39.3%)	16 (19.0%)	10 (11.9%)	1 (1.2%)	N 83
3	Does Not Copy Assignment	32 (37.6%)	31 (36.5%)	21 (24.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	N 85
4	Not Doing Homework	31 (36.0%)	33 (38.4%)	9 (10.5%)	12 (14.0%)	1 (1.2%)	N 86
5	Not Completing Test	23 (29.1%)	39 (49.4%)	9 (11.4%)	7 (8.9%)	1 (1.3%)	N 79
6	Not Doing Classwork	23 (29.1%)	34 (43.0%)	14 (17.7%)	8 (10.1%)	0 (0.0%)	N 79
7	Reading Jokebook	35 (43.8%)	32 (40.0%)	12 (15.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	N 80
8	Failing to Bring Materials	31 (40.8%)	36 (47.4%)	8 (10.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	N 76
Social Behavior Problems:							
9	Shoots Spitballs	37 (43.0%)	33 (38.4%)	11 (12.8%)	4 (4.7%)	1 (1.2%)	N 86
10	Talking	37 (46.8%)	33 (41.8%)	9 (11.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	N 79
11	Coming in Late	38 (48.1%)	31 (39.2%)	7 (8.9%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	N 78
12	Belligerent to Others	25 (28.4%)	44 (50.0%)	10 (11.4%)	6 (6.8%)	3 (3.4%)	N 88
13	Kicks Other Students	36 (43.4%)	34 (41.0%)	12 (14.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	N 82
14	Makes Sarcastic Comments	40 (46.5%)	32 (37.2%)	9 (10.5%)	4 (4.7%)	1 (1.2%)	N 86
15	Writing Obscenities	41 (51.9%)	28 (35.4%)	8 (10.1%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	N 79
16	Stamps on Paper Cup	37 (46.3%)	30 (37.5%)	11 (13.8%)	1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	N 79

A third way to examine the differences in teacher responses is to aggregate responses to the two types of problems for each teacher and perform a matched pairs t-test for the difference between the mean score on academic and behavioral problems. This analysis also shows that in both the hypothetical student study and the roll book student study, teachers were more likely to present standards for behavior problems than for academic problems. The means for standards in the hypothetical student study were 2.37 for academic problems and 2.89 for social behavior problems. With 156 teachers in the study, the difference is statistically significant at the .001 level. The means for standards in the roll book student study were 2.38 for academic problems and 2.85 for social behavior problems. With 168 teachers in the study, the difference is statistically significant at the .001 level.

Teachers in both studies were also less likely to evidence warmth in response to social behavior problems than academic problems. The means for warmth in the hypothetical student study were 1.13 for academic problems and 0.65 for social behavior problems. With 156 teachers in the study, the difference is statistically significant at the .001 level. In the roll book student study the means for warmth were 1.09 for academic problems and 0.90 for social behavior problems. With 168 teachers in the study, the difference is statistically significant at the .001 level

Discussion

With teachers far more likely to present standards for behavior problems than for academic problems, it at first appears that teachers are more

interested in behavioral control than in academic instruction. However, when we consider that teachers were far more likely to evidence warmth and concern in response to the academic problems presented by students, it is difficult to argue that schools function simply as mechanisms of social control. It is doubly difficult to explain these patterns as the result of teacher attitudes corresponding to those in the society at large. Thus in interpreting our results we will consider these aspects of the teaching/learning situation in the school organization that might function to produce the patterns we obtained.

Four factors seem to be involved in the production of such patterns of teacher behavior--the teachers' conception of the student tasks, the relative visibility of the student tasks of achievement and behavior in the classroom, the relative visibility of the teaching tasks of academic instruction and behavioral control in the school, and the extent to which teachers' supervisors possess expert power over teachers as they perform the tasks. Each of these seem to operate so that schools more closely supervise social behavior than they do academic work.

The teacher's conception of the student tasks of academic work and social behavior seem to play a part in determining the teacher's response to the classroom problems, or in other words, the teacher's supervision of the students. In their discussion of evaluation and authority systems in organizations, Dornbusch and Scott (1975) make a distinction between active tasks and inert tasks. They define active tasks as those which are low in predictability, efficacy, and clarity. Further, Dornbusch and Scott argue

that performers and supervisors prefer different approaches to supervision and evaluation for the two types of tasks so that active tasks are assigned by delegation and the execution is less closely supervised while inert tasks are assigned by directive and with execution is more closely supervised. Thus if teachers conceive of academic achievement as an active task and social behavior as an inert task, Dornbusch and Scott's theory would predict that social behavior would be more tightly supervised than academic work. This could explain the tendency for teachers to present more standards and less warmth or concern in response to social behavior problems. Indeed, in the open-ended teacher responses, teachers responded to academic problems with such comments as, "In my classes every student knows the requirements and the corresponding grades and is given an opportunity to make his own decision.", while fewer such delegations of responsibility to the student appeared in the responses to behavior problems.

Research in the attribution theory tradition also leads us to this prediction of closer supervision of social behavior than academic achievement. Reviewing studies in this tradition, Hastorf, Schneider and Polefla (1970) conclude that, " ... when failure is less attributable to lack of ability and more to lack of trying, supervisors will be more likely to hold the learner responsible for his failure ... "

Teachers responding to academic problems may present fewer standards and more warmth than the same teachers responding to behavior problems because student performance in the academic area is seen as depending upon a student's ability as well as effort while performance in the behavior area

is seen as depending primarily upon effort. Thus it might be that teachers feel that students with academic problems lack ability and need support, whereas students with behavior problems simply are not making an effort and need to be made to conform to certain standards.

A second factor that could contribute to the pattern of teacher responses is the relative visibility of the student tasks of achievement and behavior in the classroom. Behavior problems are more visible than academic problems in the classroom. Social behavior problems presented by a single student are more likely to disturb both the teacher and the other students than are academic problems. As Dornbusch and Scott observe, lack of visibility of performance is a major impediment to a soundly based system of supervision and evaluation. The greater visibility of social behavior makes it more likely that the teacher will be able to adequately supervise it than academically related behavior.

Visibility has an effect at a second level. Teaching generally takes place behind closed classroom doors. Administrators charged with supervising teachers know little of what actually happens in classrooms (Meyer and Rowan, 1978). If academic instruction and behavioral control are seen as teaching tasks, then it becomes clear that the failure to control behavior through the presentation of standards is a task that is much more visible to administrators than the failure to provide instruction and insure student effort on academic work. Teachers are likely to be held more accountable for maintaining school norms for student behavior than school norms for academic work. This situation means that schools can maintain greater control over social behavior than over academic achievement.

A final factor which might contribute to the patterns of teacher responses is extent to which those supervising teachers possess expertise in the teaching tasks of academic instruction and behavioral control. If as French and Raven (1959) suggest, the perception of a supervisor as possessing expertise in a certain area contributes to the supervisor's ability to influence the behavior of the subordinate, then we might expect administrators to be more influential in affecting a teacher's performance in the area of behavioral control than in the area of academic instruction. At the secondary level where teachers specialize in a subject area, administrators are hard pressed to claim expertise in all the areas. They are however, able to claim expertise in the more general area of controlling student behavior. This analysis would suggest that administrators will be more influential in supervising teachers on the task of controlling student social behavior than on the task of academic instruction. In general schools should be more successful at supervising social behavior than in supervising academic work.

Thus our analysis of these four aspects of the organization of schooling--the teacher's conception of the student tasks, the relative visibility of the student tasks of achievement and behavior, the relative visibility of the teaching tasks of academic instruction and behavioral control in the school, and the extent to which teacher's supervisors possess expert power over teachers as they perform these tasks--suggests that these factors will result in differences in the organizational evaluation system across the hierarchy of administrator-teacher-student levels so that student behavior problems are more tightly controlled in schools than student academic problems. Moreover, our present studies are likely to minimize the effects of these factors in producing greater teacher standards and less warmth for be-

havior problems than for academic problems. This is due to the fact that we present the academic problems to teachers in our studies in a more visible way than they are likely to be presented in actual classrooms. In addition, when we originally developed the academic problems we designed them to be problems of academic effort rather than academic performance in an attempt to minimize the tendency for teachers to attribute these problems to lack of student ability. Despite this feature of the studies, teachers still attributed academic effort problems to lack of student ability and offered concern and warmth rather than standards.

Conclusion

In both the hypothetical student study and the roll book student study, teachers were more likely to present standards in response to social behavior problems presented by students than they were in response to academic problems presented by students. This finding seems to provide support for those arguing the position that schools serve primarily as instruments of social control. However, teachers in both studies were also more likely to evidence warmth and concern in response to students presenting academic problems than they were in response to students presenting social behavior problems. Thus teachers were not unconcerned about student academic work as proponents of the "schools as mechanisms of social control position" sometimes imply.

Our analysis of the findings led us to consider the organizational properties of schools and classrooms which might account for the patterns of teacher responses. We identified several features of the organization of schools which make it easier for schools to adequately supervise social behavior than academic work.

References

Alexander, Karl, Martha Cook, and Edward L. McDill. 1978. "Curriculum Tracking and Educational Stratification." American Sociological Review 43:47-66.

Bidwell, Charles E. 1965. "The School as a Formal Organization." Pp. 972-10022 in J. G. March, ed., The Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Bowles, Samuel. 1972. "Unequal Education and the Social Division of Labor," pp. 38-66 in Martin Carnoy, ed., Schooling in a Corporate Society. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Carter, Michael A. 1976. "Contradiction and Correspondence: Analysis of the Relation of Schooling to Work," pp. 52-82 in Martin Carnoy and Henry M. Levin, eds., The Limits of Educational Reform. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Cicourel, A. V. and J. I. Kitsusel. 1965. The Educational Decision-Makers. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Dornbusch, Sanford M. and W. Richard Scott. 1975. Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Dreeben, Robert. 1968. On What is Learned in School. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

French, John R. P. and Bertram Raven. 1959. "The Bases of Social Power," pp. 259-269 in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander eds., Group Dynamics. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Guskin, Alan Edward and Samuel Louis Guskin. 1970. A Social Psychology of Education. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hastorf, Albert H., David J. Schneider and Judith Polefka. 1970. Person Perception. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Katz, Michael B. 1971. Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Meyer, John and Brian Rowan. 1978. "The Structure of Educational Organizations," pp. 78-110 in Marshall W. Meyer, ed., Environments and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Natriello, Gary and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1979a. "Bringing Behavior Back In: The Effects of Student Characteristics and Behavior on the Classroom Behavior of Teachers." Unpublished Paper, St. Louis, MO.

Natriello, Gary. 1978. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Student Characteristics on Teacher Standards and Warmth." Stanford, CA: Ph.D. Dissertation.

Natriello, Gary and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1979b. "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Student Status and Performance Characteristics," San Francisco: Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Natriello, Gary and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1980a. "Providing Direction and Building Commitment: A Study of Teacher Standards and Warmth." Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Natriello, Gary and Sanford M. Dornbusch. 1980b. "The Stratification of Socialization Processes: A View from the Classroom." St. Louis, MO: Unpublished Paper.

Rosenbaum, J. S. 1975. "The Stratification of Socialization Processes," American Sociological Review 35:1014-1027

Rosenshine, Barak. 1976. "Recent Research on Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement." Journal of Teacher Education 27:61-64

Rosenshine, Barak and Norma Furst. 1973. "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching." Pp. 122-183 in M. W. Travers, ed., Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally

Spring, Joel H. 1972. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State. Boston: Beacon Press.